

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

PORTLAND DIVISION

STEVEN R. DIXON,

Civil Case No. 09-1091-PK

Plaintiff,

ORDER

v.

SENTINEL INSURANCE COMPANY, LTD.,

Defendant.	

Michael T. Wise 806 SW Broadway, Suite 800 Portland, Oregon 97205

Attorney for Plaintiff

Francis J. Maloney III Beth Cupani Maloney Lauersdorf Reiner, P.C. 117 SW Taylor Street, Suite 300 Portland, Oregon 97204

Attorneys for Defendant

Page 1 - ORDER

KING, Judge:

The Honorable Paul Papak, United States Magistrate Judge, filed Findings and Recommendation on April 8, 2010. Plaintiff filed timely objections to the Findings and Recommendation.

When either party objects to any portion of a magistrate's Findings and Recommendation concerning a dispositive motion or prisoner petition, the district court must make a <u>de novo</u> determination of that portion of the magistrate's report. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); <u>McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore Business Machines, Inc.</u>, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), <u>cert. denied</u>, 455 U.S. 920 (1982). This court has, therefore, given <u>de novo</u> review of the rulings of Magistrate Judge Papak.

This court ADOPTS the Findings and Recommendation of Magistrate Judge Papak (#22) dated April 8, 2010 in its entirety.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Sentinel's Motion for Summary Judgment (#9) is granted. Dixon's Cross Motion for Summary Judgment (#14) is denied. This action is dismissed with prejudice.

DATED this _____ day of May, 2010.

United States District Judge